

## REMARKS

Applicant has amended all independent claims in order to more clearly recite the claimed invention. These amendments are not intended to limit the claimed invention nor are they in response to a patentability rejection.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's rejections in the order in which they appear in the Final Rejection.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

In the Final Rejection, the Examiner rejects Claims 1- 49 under 35 USC §112, first paragraph; as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner contends that the specification does not teach that the gate driver and the source driver each has a TFT. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, page 12, lns. 1-2 of the specification state "In the liquid crystal panel in this embodiment, a pixel portion, a source driver, a gate driver, etc. are integrally formed" and a manufacturing process of TFTs is explained as a manufacturing process of a liquid crystal panel in Embodiment 1. Hence, the specification teaches that each of gate driver and the source driver has a TFT.

In response to the Examiner's next objection, Applicant notes that the claims recite that each of said second TFT (in the gate driver) and said third TFT (in the source driver) has a second LDD region overlapped by gate electrodes of said second TFT and said third TFT respectively. The claims do not recite a P-channel TFT. Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly understand this from, for example, the citation "...the gate electrodes 6028 to 6030

formed for the driver circuit are formed so as to over lap the portions of the impurity regions 6017 and 6018 through the gate insulating film 6020 (see page 16, lns. 15-17 of the specification).

With respect to objection regarding the Pixel TFT and gate electrode, Applicant submits that one of ordinary skill in the art can understand the feature from, for example, the citation at page 17 ln. 18 - page 18, ln. 2 of the specification.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application provides a sufficient written description for the claimed invention, and it is request that this rejection be withdrawn.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

The Examiner also has the following rejections under 35 USC §103:

- A. Claims 1, 2, 7, 12-23, 36, 41-43, 48 and 49 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazaki et al in view of Ha.
- B. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32, 33, 37, 38, 44 and 45 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazaki et al over Ha and further in view of Yamazaki et al.
- C. Claims 5, 10, 26, 30, 34, 39 and 46 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazaki et al. over Ha and further in view of Negishi et al.
- D. Claims 6, 11, 27, 31, 35, 40 and 47 are rejected as being unpatentable over Miyazaki over Ha and further in view of Braun et al.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

More specifically, the Examiner admits that Miyazaki does not teach a pixel TFT nor drive TFTs. As a result, the Examiner cites Ha and contends that Ha teaches a TFT having a LDD region (22a) overlapping a gate wiring and refers to Fig. 5A and 5B of Ha in support thereof. However, the gate electrode in Figs. 5A and 5B of Ha is reference number 24n. Figs. 5A and 5B show LDD region 22 as not overlapped by gate electrode 24n.

Therefore, as the independent claims of the present application recite that said second TFT

and said third TFT has a second LDD region overlapped by gate electrodes of said second TFT and said third TFT respectively, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Accordingly, the claims are patentable thereover, and it is requested that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that this application is now in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 3, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark J. Murphy  
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,  
CUMMINGS & MEHLER  
200 West Adams Street, Suite 2850  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 236-8500